

**REMARKS**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed on June 24, 2004, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 1, 6, and 13 are amended. Claims 7 and 20 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 43 – 51 are added. As a result, claims 1-6, 8-19 and 43 – 51 are now pending in this patent application.

**Notification Regarding Election/Restriction**

The Office Action stated:

The examiner wishes to notify the applicant that the subject matter of non-elected claim 16 does not appear to have antecedence in the specification (note the text abridging pages 11 and 12). This issue must be addressed (or clarification given) if a generic claim from which claim 16 depends is subsequently found to be allowable.

(Office Action at 2.) Applicant agrees that the cited portion of the present specification (i.e., the text abridging pages 11 and 12) pertains to the subject matter of claim 16. Applicant has amended such text to include the text of originally-filed claim 16 to provide the requested clarification. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment to the specification does not add new matter because it simply substitutes the applicable language recited or incorporated in originally filed claim 16 into the specification.

**Objection to the Claims**

Claim 6 is objected to because of an informality. Applicant has amended claim 6 to overcome this objection. Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

**Double Patenting Rejection**

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11-15 and 17-19 were provisionally rejected for obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-23 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/643,770. Applicant does not admit that the present claims are not patentably distinct over the claims of the co-pending application serial number 10/643,770. Moreover, Applicant respectfully requests

- reconsideration of this provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection in view of the claim amendments being made herewith.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,589,420). Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 7, which the Examiner indicated to be allowable. Accordingly, Applicant believes that dependent claims 2, 4, 6 and 8 are also allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this basis of rejection of these claims.

§102/103 Rejection of the Claims

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S. C. 103(a) as obvious over Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,589,420). Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this basis of rejection because no *prima facie* case of obviousness presently exists with respect to this claim for the reasons given above with respect to the § 102 rejection.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 5 and 12 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for obviousness over Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,589,420) in view of Mouchawar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,115).

Claims 9-11, 13-15 and 18 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for obviousness over Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,589,420).

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for obviousness over Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,589,420) in view of Mouchawar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,321,115).

Claims 13, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for obviousness over Maker (U.S. Patent No. 4,960,123) in view of Adams et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,589,420).

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these bases of rejection of these claims because no *prima facie* case of obviousness presently exists with respect to this claim for the reasons given above with respect to the § 102 rejection.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7 and 20 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has adopted the language of claims 7 and 20 into independent claims 1 and 13, respectively, and cancelled claims 7 and 20. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of independent claims 1 and 13 and their respective dependent claims.

New Claims

New claims 43 – 51 have been added to more particularly point out and distinctly claim aspects of the present systems and methods that are closely related to the subject matter indicated by the Examiner to be allowable. Applicant respectfully submits that these new claims are fully supported by the present patent specification, such as at page 9, lines 20 – 30. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of these new claims.

Withdrawn claim

Claim 16 was withdrawn by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Insofar that claim 16 depends from and includes all of the language of independent claim 1, which Applicant believes to be allowable, Applicant respectfully requests re-introduction and allowance of claim 16.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6951 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SUREKHA PALREDDY

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.  
P.O. Box 2938  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
(612) 373-6951

Date September 28, 2004

By S. Arora

Suneel Arora  
Reg. No. 42,267

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 28 day of September, 2004.

Paula Srich  
Name

Paula Srichy  
Signature